

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER POR PATENTS PO Box (430 Alexandra, Virginia 22313-1450 www.ouplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/579,668	05/17/2006	Osamu Aoki	P06,0070	9380		
26574 SCHIFF HARI	7590 06/15/2009 DIN I I P		EXAM	EXAMINER		
PATENT DEP	ARTMENT		WILLIAMS,	WILLIAMS, JEFFERY L		
6600 SEARS T CHICAGO, IL			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
			2437			
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/579,668	AOKI ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
JEFFERY WILLIAMS	2437		

The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
THE REPLY FILED 01 June 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.
1. Q The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 4.1.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:
periods. The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailling date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailling date of the final rejection.
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1,136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1,136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extensions for extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension set of the saturation of the saturation of the fee. The appropriate extension and the saturation of the s
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>
 ∑ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) ∑ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) ∑ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).
4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. \(\subseteq for purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s); a) \(\subseteq \) will not be entered, or b) \(\subseteq \) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. 🔲 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

Claim(s) rejected: 15-28.

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the	attached Information	Disclosure Statement	t(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)	
13. Other: _				

/Emmanuel L. Moise/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2437

/Jeffery Williams/ Examiner, Art Unit 2437 Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's amendments fail to simplify issues for appeal. For example, applicant's amendment to claim 16 ("wherein said fifth software stops operation by said input/output data when said sixth software determines...") adds new matter, as was similarly indicated within the rejection of 3/23/09. Furthermore, the recitations introduced by the applicant's amendment differs in scope from the previously recited language, thus necessitating further search and/or consideration.

The examiner notes that applicant's arguments are unpersuasive. For example, applicant alleges that he recitations of a plurality of software distinguished as "first", "second", "third", "fourth, "fifth", etc. is clearly supported by the applicant's pland disclosure. Applicant refers to points in a flowchart of a monitoring program as support for this. However, other than mere allegation, the applicant fails to provide any evidence or argument in support of the allegation that the flowchart points of a monitoring program constitute the recited the plurality of software distinguished as "first", "second", "third", "fourth", "fifth", etc. Furthermore, the applicant fails to offer any reasonable interpretation for the language pertaining to a clurality of software distinguished as "first", "second", "third", "fourth", "fifth", etc.